

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 14, 21 and 25 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. New Claim 34 has been added. Thus, claims 1-34 are pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings and the Specification. The specification has been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, proposed drawings have been submitted for the Examiner's approval. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all objections.

The Examiner rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §102 these rejections all fully traversed below.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated *Stevens*, TCP/IP illustrated, volume1 (*Stevens*). As noted by the Examiner, *Stevens* illustrates the TCP/IP protocol suite. It is also noted that *Stevens* describes implementation of a link layer, TCP connection establishment and termination, TCP interactive data flow, TCP bulk data flow, and TCP timeout and retransmission.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the recited sections of *Stevens* do not teach transmission information in a client/server object-based computing system. As such, *Stevens* does not teach operations related to a packet of data which includes data representing an object in the client/server object-based computing system.

Claim 1, pertains to a method for transmitting a packet of data from a first computing system to a second computing system. It should be noted that the first computing system and the second computing system being are included in a client/server object-based computing system. As such, claim 1, among other things, recites identifying a packet of data using the first computing system, wherein the packet of data includes data which represents an object in the client/server object-based computing system. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the object being identified as an object which the second computing system has an interest in receiving updates. It is earnestly believed that *Stevens* does not teach these feature. As such, *Stevens* cannot possibly teach any of the operations of attempting to send the packet of data, determining when the packet of data is received by the second computing system, and sending an acknowledgment from the second computing system in context of the invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is believed to be patentable over *Stevens* for at least these reasons. In addition, claims that are dependent on claim 1 are patentable over *Stevens*. Moreover these dependent claims recite additional features which render them patentable for additional reasons. Furthermore, independent claims 9,14, 21 and 25

recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted these claims and their dependent claims are patentable over *Stevens* for similar reasons. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all claim rejections.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-33 are patentably distinct over *Stevens*. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
650-961-8300